

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-42 are pending in this application. Claim 6-12, 26-30, 32-34, 36, 38-40, and 42 stand withdrawn from consideration as directed to a non-elected invention. Claims 1-5, 31, and 37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by US Patent 7,006,253 to Fuchigami et al. (herein "Fuchigami"). Claims 21-25, 35, and 41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Fuchigami in view of US Patent 6,621,595 to Fan et al. (herein "Fan"). Those rejections are traversed by the present response as discussed next.

The claims are amended by the present response to clarify features recited therein. Independent claim 1 now recites "a scanning unit that optically reads an original color image and acquires a RGB signal corresponding to the original color image". That subject matter is believed to be clear from the original specification, see for example page 10, lines 2-6. The other active independent claims are similarly amended. The claims now also recite to vary conversion coefficients according to "color materials of which the original color image is made". Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as written positively distinguish over the previously applied art.

The claims as written are directed to an image processing apparatus or method in which an original color RGB signal is converted into a CMY signal based on preset coefficients that will vary based on characteristics of color materials of which the original color image is made, and further the original color image is input by a scanning unit.

With respect to the noted conversion unit the outstanding rejection cited element 133b in Fuchigami.¹

¹ Office Action of June 6, 2008, bottom of page 3.

In reply to that grounds for the rejection, Applicants note Fuchigami discloses element 133b as part of a feature amount calculation unit 133b. Fuchigami specifically states with respect to element 133b:

With respect to a *region around a pixel of interest* (such as the region shown in FIGS. 5-8), the first feature amount calculation section 133b outputs a density variation amount as a feature amount, while *the second feature amount calculation section 133a outputs a density value multiplied by a predetermined coefficient*. As a result, different feature amount calculation results are obtained.²

From the above-noted disclosure it is clear in Fuchigami the second feature amount calculation section 133b is directed to the features of a region around a pixel of interest.

Applicants respectfully submit such an element 133b does not correspond to the claimed “conversion unit” or “converting” operations that convert a RGB signal into a CMY signal based on a scanned input image. The element 133b in Fuchigami does not have any of such operations.

In contrast to the claimed invention, the technique disclosed in Fuchigami merely changes coefficients of color transformation based on “color characteristics”, as noted in the Office Action, but the technique of Fuchigami does not change the coefficients of color transformation based on characteristics of “color materials of which the original color image is made” and as “input by a scanner”.

Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit that at least further dependent claims 4 and 5 even further distinguish over the applied art, in way not fully recognized in the Office Action.

² Fuchigami at column 12, lines 32-38 (emphasis added).

With respect to the features recited in dependent claims 4 and 5 the outstanding rejection cited Fuchigami at column 8, lines 23-30; column 13, line 65 to column 14, line 6; and column 2, lines 64-67.³

The further relied upon citation in Fuchigami at column 13, line 65 to column 14, line 6 is merely a broad disclosure in Fuchigami that a determination method can be changed in accordance with the color of the background of a character or letter. That disclosure in Fuchigami is also not even directed to the operation of the noted second feature amount calculation section 133b; that is, that further disclosure in Fuchigami is also not directed to the element cited in Fuchigami to correspond to the claimed “conversion unit”.

Moreover, the disclosure in Fuchigami in column 13, line 65 to column 14, line 6 is also not even directed to the claimed features of converting the RGB signal into the CMY signal based on color materials of which the original color image is made.

With respect to the features recited in previously pending dependent claims 4 and 5, the further citations in Fuchigami directed to those features are not even directed to the noted conversion unit 133b. Specifically, at cited column 8, lines 23-30 Fuchigami references a color conversion section 131 that can convert RGB image signals to CMY image signals. That disclosure in Fuchigami, however, is not even directed to the noted second conversion unit 133b. The basis for the outstanding rejection is unfounded as the noted element 133b cited to correspond to the claimed “conversion unit” or “converting operations” does not even incorporate the features noted at column 8, lines 23-30.

Moreover, the noted disclosure at column 8, lines 23-30 is also not even directed to the claimed features of converting the RGB signal into the CMY signal.

With respect to features in dependent claim 5, the outstanding rejection cited Fuchigami at column 2, lines 64-67 which states in its entirety:

³ Office Action of June 6, 2008, the paragraph bridging pages 4 and 5.

FIG. 1 schematically shows the internal structure of a color image forming apparatus according to the present invention, which is, for example, a digital color copying machine that forms a duplicate image of a color image.

That disclosure in Fuchigami is also completely unrelated to the second feature amount calculation section 133b again cited in Fuchigami to correspond to the claimed “conversion unit” or “converting operations”. Also, that broad statement in Fuchigami is unrelated to the claimed features in which the preset conversion coefficients for converting a RGB signal into a CMY signal are changed based on whether the original color image is any one of a print image, a photographic printing paper image, or a photocopy image. The statement of being able to utilize a digital copy machine that forms a duplicate image of a color image in Fuchigami is completely unrelated to such claimed features.

In view of the foregoing comments, Applicants respectfully submit Fuchigami fails to disclose or suggest the “conversion unit” as now clarified in independent claims 1 and 21, or the “converting” operations now recited in independent claims 31, 35, 37, and 41. Thereby, the claims as currently written are believed to patentably distinguish over Fuchigami.

Moreover, no teachings in Fan were cited with respect to the above-noted features, and no teachings in Fan are believed to cure the above-discussed deficiencies in Fuchigami.

In view of the present response Applicants respectfully submit the claims as currently written are allowable over the previously applied art.

As no other issues are pending in this application, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and it is hereby respectfully requested that this case be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



James J. Kulbaski
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 34,648

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/07)

Surinder Sachar
Registration No. 34,423

I:\ATTY\SNS\24's\242243\242243US-AM2.DOC